G. R. S. 59] GPB—15,000—22-7-14

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

1900-1901
~~191~~ .
(Miscellaneous) 131

File No. 131

Serial Nos.

Papers Filed.

Month—

SUBJECT.

Rejecting the petition of Narayanda Dikshit, Archak of the Sri Parameswaraswamy temple at Mysore Fort appealing against the order of the Palace Controller transferring him to the Sri Manonmaneswaraswamy temple outside Mysore

PREVIOUS REFERENCES. LATER REFERENCES.

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

MUZRAI BRANCH.

OFFICE NOTE

SUBJECT

Petitions nos 849 and 1037 dated - December 1900 and 26th February 1901, respectively, from Nanjunda Dikshita, Archak of the Sri Trimeswaraswami Temple at Mysore, appealing against the order of the Palace Controller, transferring him as a less pay to the Manamaneswaraswami Temple at Annamanora Kola (about 5 miles from Mysore)

LAST REFERENCE. ~~Letter No~~ ~~dated~~

~~from~~

Archak

And

Palace Controller's

Rubkari nos 1061 and

1125 dated 24th April &

12th May 1901 respectively submitting

the records connected with

the above. —

~~~~

On the 18th April 1900,

one M. N. Subba Rao,

(address not known)

presented a petition to the

Panchayatdar of the Sri Sri-

-neswaraswami Temple,

stating that his Appellant,

Nanjunda Dikshit, addressed

a female member of his house

in singular, the previous

day, at about 10 O'clock

in the morning, while

the
~~~~

She was sitting in the Temple; that he spoke to her obscene words (illegible) and; that he had already personally informed this to him (Parthasarathy Iyengar) and to Venkataramanuja Das; and requested that due notice might be taken of the Archak's conduct.

The Parthasarathy Iyengar submitted this petition the same day to the Palace Court stating that the allegations contained in the petition were reported to be true and therefore recommending his

Vide Parthasarathy Iyengar's report no 25 dated 18th April 1901.

his transfer to some

unimportant temple in any

village.

On the same day, the

Peripathegar submitted another

petition (which is dated

19th April 1901) purporting

to be from one Puttamma,

daughter of Venkata Lakshamma

in which the petitioner stated

that she went to the temple

on the evening of the 16th

idem and was sitting with

one Annamanaiva, opposite

to Dakshinamurti Temple;

that Archak Ranjundiah

brought a potful of water

threw poured it on her

head

heard; that on her asking
him why he did so, he abused
her right and left; and
that the devotees that came
to the temple as well as
Ranganna, the Temple Cook,
had witnessed the scene
In submitting this petition
the Sarpathagar reported
that the allegations con-
-tained in the petition
were true; and that the Archak
gave him very impertinent
answers when questioned;
and added that as he
was very troublesome to the
devotees that came to the
temple and very mischievous,
dee

due notice might be taken

of his conduct.

Thereupon, the Palace

Controller took the depositions statements

of Arehak Ranjundiah,

Cook Ramjamma and Girle

Venkamma (sister in

Complainant M.R. Subba Rao)

The deposition of the

Arehak Ranjundiah (which

is dated 22nd April 1900) on the petition of M.R. Subba Rao,

runs as follows: —

"As stated in the

Complaint petition (of

M.R. Subba Rao), the

fact of my having

addressed the petitioner's

younger sister as

"[illegible]" is

*X A girl of about

12 years.

" is true. This young girl used to ask me every day for flowers, and likewise she asked me 3 days ago and I told her "ಕೊಡ್ತೀನಿ ಆಮೇಲೆ".

The deposition of the Archak on the petition of Puttamma, runs as follows: —

" I did not pour a potful of water on the complainant's head as stated in her petition; I was going to offer ಪೂಜೆ to Dakshinamurti The pot I had in my hand being a little oily

oily, it slipped from

my hand and fell down."

Cook Ramyamma's deposition :-

"I did not see the

Archak Ramjumma Deekshit

pour water on the

Complainant's head

but I heard her abusing

him, saying that he

had poured water."

The deposition of Venkamma

daughter younger sister

of M. N. Subba Rao,

aged 12 years :-

"At about 12 noon [*] on the 21st of this month [*],

I was sitting in the Maidan

at the Southern gate of

the

[*] The complainant M. N. Subba Rao states in his petition that it was at about 10 o'clock in the morning on the 14th

"the temple, drying black
grass. The Arabak
Ranjunda Deekshit-
made signs to me twice
calling me (w—o of w—o
of o∂ɔ o w ɒ—o ∧ ʃ ɾ ɾ
ɣ—o o ɒ ∂ɔ) I kept-
quiet. He again called
me "w—o of w—o of". I
was afraid and
went home and re-
lated to my brother
what had happened
I thought that it was
with some bad motive
that he called me
"w—o of w—o of". Nobody
was there when this
happened, and now

never before this had

this Nanjunda Deekshit-

called me so.

I am married,

but I have not attained

puberty. Whenever my

brother's wife went

to the temple and any

one came to present

her with ☺ ₹ 10, this

Nanjunda Deekshit

used to say that he

would himself present

it to her. And on

ten occasions I

have seen this man

giving flowers to her,

touching her hand.

On

On account of this
my sister-in-law left-
off coming to the temple.
Nanjunda Deekshit
asked me 10 times
as to why my sister-
in-law was not going
to the temple. Whenever
my sister-in-law
went to the Chandikeswara
Temple near "ಪಂಪಾ
ಕ್ಷೇತ್ರ" this Nanjunda
Deekshit was used
to stand near her
I have seen this
but I have not seen
him touch her (ಮುಟ್ಟಿ

[illegible]

[illegible]".

The Palace Controller

thereupon passed the following

order now dated 26th April 1900:—

"I have heard the Archak

and the Complainant, and

took their statements, as

well as those of certain

others.

2. There is no doubt-

that the Archak's Conduct

is open to grave suspicion

although there is not-

enough evidence to

send the case to the

Magistrate He had

no business to speak

"speak as he did to a solitary girl, who is just budding into womanhood, at the temple when there was no one present. He also insulted another woman in another way.

3. I should like to have also examined the wife of the girl's brother but the latter would not produce her as he alleges that it is not considered reasonable for ladies to attend the office.

4. The Archak

"Ramjumada Dakshit is
suspended for 3 months;
When the suspension is over
it will be considered
whether he should be
retained in the same
temple" ⁂

The above order was duly
communicated to the Parbathayar
of the Temple.

On the 28th July 1900,
the Parbathayar again reported
to the Palace Controller that
the suspension period was
over on the 27th July 100, and
the latter thereupon issued
⊗
a second order transferring
the appellant
~~the~~ Ramjumada Dakshit as

⁂ Under this order
the Palace Controller
has noted in red ink
"Replied to H.H."
10-5-00

⊗ No 226 dated 12th
September 1900

as Archak of the Manon-
-maneswaraswami Temple
on a salary of Rs 5 per
month. Then the Petitioner
applied for a copy of this
order, but the Palace Contr-
refused to grant it (vide
Encl- no 366 dated 21-st-
October 1900).

It is against this
order, the man has now
appealed to Government.
The Appeal grounds are:-

i That he has been
the Archak of the Trinesvara
-Swami Temple for the last
35 years;

Under this order the
Palace Controller has
noted in red ink
"Sanctioned by H.H."
12-9-00.

ii That the Archakship of this temple has been a hereditary one in his family for the past 7 generations

iii That the Palace Controller has transferred him as Archak of the Manonmaneswara - Swami Temple, upon the false Complaint of those that had ill-feeling towards him;

iv That the Palace Controller never examined him and the Complainant together, nor did he was he informed of the particular charge brought against him;

v That the Palace Controller refused

refused to grant him a copy of his order to appeal to Government, but issued him a notice, stating that he would forfeit the Huk if he did not join duty immediately;

vi That some ill-feeling exists between him and the Complainant Subba Rao as well as the Peripathegar Venkatesiah; and that he cannot prove this by documentary evidence;

vii That it has been the practice either to fine or suspend the Archaks for

for their misconduct

and not to transfer them

from place to place, as has

been done in his case;

VIII That the Thiruvarur

Swami Temple is an im-

portant and much frequented

by devotees, but the Manu

Manneswaraswami Temple

is not such an one;

& IX That he was getting

a pay of Rs 7 in the Thiruvarur

Swami Temple, but that

he has been now transferred

to the Manumannaneswara Swami

Temple on Rs 5.;

The Appellant has

presented a Memorandum with

his

his Appeal petition, signed by some of the devotees such as Dharmadhikari Sundaresastriar and others and also states that the Dharmadhikari to show that he is a respectable man; may be consulted as regards his conduct. And in conclusion he prays that the order of transfer issued by the Palace Centre may be cancelled and that he be retained in the Trineswaraswami Temple

Submitted for orders.

20/6/07

Subd to the Dewan

24/6/07

(21)

There are no grounds
whatever. The
appeal must be
rejected.

18.VIII.07

(23)

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note contd :— orders were accordingly issued in Govt Pro no 334 dated 5th September 1901. Ranjunda Dekshith, Archak of the Manonmaneswara Swamy temple at Mysore who had been transferred from the Archakship held by him in the Trineswara Swamy temple by the Palace Controller on the score of his misconduct, has presented a petition No 4662 of 14-6-05. praying for his restoration to the former service

Submitted. } Trineswara swamy temple
He begs that, if he
be considered guilty, the Govt
may be pleased to deem the punishment
hitherto inflicted on him as being
sufficient and that his restoration
be ordered —

Submitted

Ks
23/7/05 — send this to the present Palace Officer for enquiry & report
31/7/05

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note contd.

The Palace officer reports, in reply, that the petitioner's appeal in the matter refd. to, was rejected by Govt in their order no. 336 - M:7·17-97 dy 5th Septr. 1901

Flag A)

Submtd.

30/8/05

It is fact that Govt passed orders on 5th Sep 1901 as known to us. Ask the Palace Officer what is his opinion as to the Petrs representation that he has been sufficiently punished and that he may be re-transferred

30/8/05

Note contd:-

In reply to the enquiry ordered above, the Palace Officer states that it is no desirable to re-transfer the Petr to the Sri Vineswa

o 39/4 dy 11 9 05

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Temple wherefrom his removal was due to ~~the~~ his misconduct. The pet^r gets the same pay viz Rs 5 in the Manonmaneswaraswami Temple & also gets Rs 10 per mensem ~~p~~ Pariahan The present Archak in the Trineswaraswami temple is stated to be doing good work

~~(Reference is respectfully invited to the Dewan's order recorded on page 1 of this note)~~

Submtd
22/9/05

22/9/05

Petitioner may be informed that Govt decline to order his re-transfer to the Sri Trineswaraswami Temple

Submtd to the Dewan through the 2nd Cr

Ellamma Samba
23/9/05

6 Q
23.9.05.

25/9/05

Dewan
25/9/05

8930
25.9.05

2.X.05

Read
3/10/05

5/10/05

1 T 0

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05

Muz. 8A]

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Note Continued.

As ordered by the Late Dewan on Page 25 of this Note, Nanjunda Deekshit, Archak of the Sri Manonmaneswara Swami temple on Mysore-Nanjangud road, was informed in this office No. 1757 dated the 6th Oct 05, that Govt decline to order his re-transfer to the Sri Laineswaraswami temple in Mysore Fort

Sub E

on 31st March '06, the same individual petitioned this office stating that, if his re-transfer cannot be ordered, the Varawara of Archakship in the Sri Laineswaraswami temple be made in the name of his minor Son, Srikanta Deekshit, and that until he comes of age, a Gumasta may, on his behalf, be appointed to look after the duties connected therewith. In reply to the above, the Petitioner was directed to apply to the

Sub F

Palace Officer in the first instance

27

File No. of 190 Muzrai Secretariat.

Sick Paper under disposal.

Now, the has presented to this office, an appeal Petition, Regd No. 821 of 8th June '06 against the orders of the Palace officers, who has declined to comply with the Petitioner's request in the matter of transferring the varawed of archak post to his minor's son's name. He has also produced in original the Endorsement granted by the Palace officer. He concludes, he prays that order passed by the Palace officer may favourably be reconsidered.

Submitted

8/9 - 5/2/06

MGCPB—2,500—1-8-05.

Muzrai Secretariat. File No. of 190

Muzrai Secretary's remarks.

The Petitioner, an Archak in the Sri Trinesvaraswami temple in the Fort at Mysore, was transferred from that temple to the Manonmanesvara temple outside Mysore, owing to misconduct in connection with certain female visitors to the first named temple. His subsequent petitions for his retransfer were all rejected.

He now asks that his Baravard may be made out in the name of his minor son and that the work may be done by a substitute until his son attains his majority. The Palace Officer has declined to comply with his request.

I am also of the humble opinion that the Petitioner's request should not be granted. Although his appointment is a hereditary one, he should not, I think, be permitted to have his baravard transferred to his son merely because he has been punished by Government for misconduct.

Subd. to the 2nd. Councillor] Ananda Sami Rao

File No.	of 190	Muzrai Secretariat.

522
10 9 06 There is no reason to change
the Burmah now. Agree
with the Secretary KBN
10/9/06

Draft accepted KK
10/9/06

Draft submitted
KS
14/9/06

3/1/01

Call for the records
7/4/01

ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ ਸਾਰੇ

Muz. 7] MYSORE MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

ನಂ. 711 En6

ರಾಯಿದಾರಿ

ಮೈಸೂರು ಗಾರ್ಡ್‌ಮಿಂದ ಮುಜರಾಯಿ ಇಲಾಖೆ

ಬೆಂಗಳೂರು ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ
190 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ ಫೆಬ್ರವರಿ

By Order,

~~Muzrai~~ Secretary.

18/4/01

18/4/01

Written on her application

No. 801/మి 4 - 5 - 1901 రుసుం చెల్లి

అరవ నీశ-ంబ్రహ్మశ్రీ లరవిందం
ద లు ల్రీ లు వంశీ 24 నీమ రస్థం 1061 నే
నం బ రీ రుసుం చెల్లి నోళ్ళ తలం లు లీ లు

శ్రీ శ్రీ మోళ్ళేశ్వర స్వామి లు వర చేళ్ళ
దు లాంబికా శ్రీ నం సిద్ధ నం బు ం ర్తి శ్రీ నన్న
వు నోళ్ళ నోళ్ళేశ్వర స్వామి లు వర దేవ సన్నిధి
శ్రీ వ న ల్ల వం ర్తి ద వి చ్చా లు వాం ర్తి శ్రీ ం ర్తి
~~శ్రీ~~ నం గ ర్తి వం ది రా లు వ ది ల్లూ —

లు వ నన్న కె శిం కళ్ళ కి ర్ష్ణం ర్తి ర శ
ష్ణం ర్తి మం ర్తి రా లు వ ద ర చుం బ రు శి శీ ల ర్తి ళ్ళ -
వం ర్తి శ్రీ వం ది రా లు శ్రీ - నం ర్తి ర న ర్తి ద ది రా లు వ
శి శీ ల ర్తి ళ్ళ కి ర ద లు ల్లూ కి కె ళ్ళు కొ శీ శీ ర్తి బీ
శీ గి లు ం రుసుం చెల్లి లు న్న అ ర వు నీ వ
ట్రహ్మశ్రీ లరవర వళ్ళకి శ్రీళ్ళు కొ శీ లు

By order
11 3/5/11
Dy Secretary

hs

27/4/07

OFFICE OF THE DEPUTY
Date: 7242
Reg. No.
MUZRAE BRANCH

ಬಹುಶಃ ನಿಮಗೆ ಗೊತ್ತಿರಬಹುದು
ಕೊನೆಯಲ್ಲಿ ಅಲ್ಲಿ ಇಲ್ಲಿ
ಸಿಂಹಗಳ ಚಿತ್ರ ಇದೆ ಅಲ್ಲವೇ
ಇಲ್ಲಿ

ಸಿಂಹಗಳಿದೆ

ಸ

for orders

Mysore

Read :—

~~Appeal~~ Petition No. 849 dated 3rd January 1901, from ~~the~~ Nanjunda Dikshit, Archak of the Sri Vineswaraswami temple at Mysore Fort, appealing against the order of the Palace Controller ~~Mysore~~, transferring him to the Sri Manonmaneswara Swami Temple at Aunnanavarakola (about 5 miles from Mysore

And, Correspondence ending with Rubkari No. 1125 dated 12th May

1901, from the Palace Controller, calling on him submitting the records of the case.

Order thereon

R. O. 334 En Upk
Inscr 7-17.97

It appears from D/ 5th Sept. 1901. the records ~~received with~~ X R.O. 335 D/ 5-9.01 ~~the above~~, that ~~the~~ the Palace Controller, transferred his ~~the~~ Archak to a less important temple ~~as~~ on the score of his misconduct his conduct in the Vri Tirumeswaraswami Temple was of an immoral nature. ~~Temple~~ The Govt. see no grounds to interfere with the

order of the Palace
Controller The appeal
is accordingly rejected

Peshawari Order) 21/8/11

By Secretary

To,
The Palace Controller
Mysore

Ref: Records

End: to Ref:

in the terms of the above
order

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
4662

Mysore

Reference

14/6/05

No 799 Conf
Muz. 3 800 dtd 8.05

GOVT. OF H. H. THE MAHARAJA
OF MYSORE,

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

No.

The accompanying Petition No. 4662
dated 14.6.05 received at this
Office from Sanjeeva Deekshit,
Archak of the Manonmaneswara
Swamidevaru, a Palace
Muz. Institution, Re or
Mysore, praying for his
retainership to the Sri

~~is forwarded, together with its~~
~~enclosures, to the~~

Trineswara Swamidevaru
in Mysore fort, is forwarded
to the officer in charge of
the Palace Establishments,
Mysore, ~~in Confirmation~~
~~of the Govt. Roc. No. 334-5~~
~~dt. 3.11.97~~
~~dt 5.9.1901~~, for enquiry
and report, together with
his opinion

By Order,

DH) 5/8/05

Secretary,
Muzrai Department.

BANGALORE,
19

3.8.05

4/8/05

Govt order

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
983
28.8.05
MUZRAI SECRETARIAT

No:- 32 The Palace Office,

Mysore, Dated 26th August 1905.

27 a

Rupees
Rs
28/8/05

From,

B. Ramakrishna Row, Esq.,
Officer in charge of the
Palace Establishments, M y s o r e.

To,

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,
Secretary to the Hovernment of Mysore,
Muzroi Department, B a n g a l o r e.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your Official Memorandum No: 799 dated 10th Instant, forwarding for report Petition No: 4662 of 14th June 1905, -herewith retransmitted -of one Nanjunda-Dikshit Archak of the Manonmanesvara Swami temple, a Palace Muzroy Institution, near Mysore, and in reply to invite your kind attention to the Government Proceedings No: 334 Muz.F.17 - 97 dated 5th September 01 rejecting the petitioner's appeal in the matter referred to in his present petition.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

B Ramakrishnaiah
Officer in charge of 27/8/05
the Palace Estts.

M.K.V.
Compd. Gift

Draft as per Secretary's order

MUZRAI

19 —19

FROM

To The officer in charge of the Palace Estts Mysore

Dated

Despatched 7 September

Received

General No. 1278

Muzrai F. No.

Enclosure one

Adverting to his letter no 32 of 26th August 1905 reporting upon the petition of Nanjunda Dikshith, Archak of the Manonmaneswaraswamy temple at Mysore, praying for his retransfer to the ~~Archaka~~ ~~Shipe of the~~ Sri Trineswara Swamy temple at the place, ~~he~~ has the honor to ~~request to~~ state be furnished with his opinion as to the petitioner's representation that he has been sufficiently

Head-the first-Head-Govt-passed orders on the 5th September 1901 is known to this Office The act of this Office reference

MGCPB—2,000—9-6 02

furnishes ~~for his report~~ regarding ~~his~~ Archakship and that he may be re-transferred as Archak of the Sri Trineswaraswamy temple. The Palace Contr. is requested to furnish the Govt with his opinion on this point.

By order.

~~Draft~~

10th August 1905 was, with a view to ascertaining the opinion of the Palace officers in the matter of the petitioner's representation that he has been suffering

This petition is ~~Secretary~~ duly returned

Ds
31/8/05

B
4/9/05
Secretary

Ds Judicial Dept

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE
1283
16.9.05
MUZRA No. 39

The Palace Office,

Mysore, Dated 11th September 1905.

15-m

Refers
Jes
16/9/05

From,

B. Ramakrishna Row, Esq.,

Officer in charge of the Palace Estts., Mysore.

cancld & subst. forders
9/05

To,

L. Anantasami Rao, Esq.,

Secretary to the Government of Mysore,

Muzroi Department,- Bangalore.

Sir,

I have the honor to acknowledge the receipt of your No: - 1278 of the 7th Instant on the subject of the petition of Nanjunda - Dikshit, Archak of Sri Manónmanésvara Svami temple, near Mysore on - the Nanjangud Road, and in reply to state that I have carefully gone through the papers connected with the petitioner's transfer to that Temple from the Temple of Sri Trinésvarasvami five years ago. His removal from the latter would seem to be due to his misconduct brought home to him. He has not suffered as regards his emoluments in this - respect his pay being the same as before, viz., ₹5/-, p.m., and he also gets ₹10/- p.m., on account of Paditara at the temple of Sri - Manónmanésvara Svami. His successor Chowda Dikshit is, I understand, doing the work of Archak well and satisfactorily in the Temple of Sri Trinesvarasvami and is an Agamika Vadama Bramhin while the petitioner is of the Shiva Nambi Class.

* e-transmitted. 9/05

2. I accordingly beg to submit that it would be undesirable to disturb Chowda Dikshit there, while, to re-transfer Nanjunda Dikshit to this very temple might create an inconvenient precedent, as his original

original transfer does not seem to have been either temporary or conditional. The present Parpatyagar's report in the matter is enclosed.

I have the honor to be,

Sir,

Your most obedient servant,

B Ramakrishnaiah

Officer in charge of the
Palace Establishments.

13.9.08

M.K.V.
comps

No. 1757 D/6.10.05

1797

Endorsement granted to Ranjunda Deekshit, Archak in the Sri Manonmaneswara swami temple, at Annanavara Kola near Mysore, with reference to his petn registered No. 4662, dated the 14th June 1905, praying for his retransfer to the Sri Trineswaraswami temple at Mysore, as Archak thereof.

—"—

In reply, the petitioner is informed that the Govt decline to order his re-transfer to the Sri Trineswaraswami temple as prayed for by him. His petition is accordingly rejected

By Order,

5/10/05

Mur Secretary

No. 1758 D/6.10.05 Enc. 3

Copy to the Offr in charge of the Palace Establishments, Mysore, with reference to his letter No 39/4 dy 11th Sept 1905

By Order,

Mur Secretary

(Dewan's order)

5/10/05

Refer
10/8/16

COURT FEE ONE RUPEE

COURT FEE

MYSORE GOVERNMENT

MYSORE GOVERNMENT
AGRICULTURAL SECRETARIAT

ಅರಮನೆಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್‌ರವರ

ಆಫೀಸ್‌ನಿಂದಾ.

—:o:—

ಮೈಸೂರ್ ಸಿಟಿ ಮುನಿಸಿಪಾಲಿಟಿಯವರು ಹೊಸದಾಗಿ ಕಟ್ಟಿಸಿರುವ ಕಟ್ಟಡಗಳಿಗೆ
ಹೊಸ ನಂಬರುಗಳನ್ನು ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ಗೆ ಇಂಡಾರ್ಸ್
ಆ ಪ್ರಕಾರ ಮೊನ್ನೆ ಶ್ರೀ ಪುಟ್ಟಸ್ವಾಮಿಯವರಿಗೆ ಕೊಟ್ಟಿರುವ ನಂಬರಿನ
ಅಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರತಿಯನ್ನು ಇದರ ಜೊತೆಗೆ ಕಳುಹಿಸಿ ಅವರಿಂದ ಪಾವತಿ ರಸೀದಿಯನ್ನು
ಪಡೆದು ಕಳುಹಿಸಿಕೊಡಲು ಅವರಿಗೆ ತಿಳಿಸಿದೆ. ಅವರು ಇಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ
ಇದರ ಬಾಬ್ತಿನಿಂದ ರೂ ಶೇ ಕಟ್ಟಿರುವುದಾಗಿ ತಿಳಿಸಿದರು.
ವಿಚಾರವಾಗಿ ಬರೆದುಕೊಂಡ 11.4.06 ನೇ ಮತ್ತು 1109 ನೇ ನಂಬರು
ಅರ್ಜಿಯು ಕೃತಜ್ಞವಾಯಿತು.

ಅಚ್ಚು ಪ್ರತಿ ರೂಪಾಯಿಯನ್ನು ಸಹಿಸಲು
ಇತ್ತಿದ್ದಾರೆ

17/4/06

ತಾರೀಖು 18 —— ನೇ ಮಾಹೆ
ಏಪ್ರಿಲ್ ಸನ್ 1906 ನೇ ಇಸವಿ } ಅರಮನೆಯ ಇಂಜಿನಿಯರ್ ಆಫೀಸರ್.

(Draft as per II b/d order)

Muz. 7]

GOVERNMENT OF HIS HIGHNESS THE MAHARAJA OF MYSORE.

MUZRAI DEPARTMENT.

Dated Sept 1906.

ENDORSEMENT granted to Nanjunda Deekshit, Archaka of the Sri Manonmaneswaraswami temple at Mysore Nanjangud road

in reply to his Appeal Petition Registered No. 821 dated 8th June 06, praying that the varavard of Archakship in the Sri Triineswaraswami temple at Mysore, be made out in the name of his minor son.

Petitioner is informed that Government see no reason to have the said varavard changed to his minor son's name now

2 The enclosure is returned

By order,

Secretary

Copy to the Palace officer, Mysore, for information

By Order,

Secretary, Muzrai Department.

AB 1000 5-

14/9/06